

Herrmannsen (1849) had designated *Obliquaria subrotunda* Rafinesque, 1820 (currently *Obovaria subrotunda*) as the type species. They established the new genus *Cyclonaias* for *Obliquaria tuberculata*. It is surprising that Ortmann & Walker (1922) cite Herrmannsen's type designation for *Rotundaria* but not his designation for *Obovaria* (pp. 407, 132 in the same volume). However, in this case, Herrmannsen was not the first to select a type. Valenciennes (1827) reported *Obliquaria tuberculata* specimens from Rafinesque, which he says were identified as the type of a new genus, *Rotundaria*. Thus, *Rotundaria* is a senior objective synonym of *Cyclonaias*. *Cyclonaias tuberculata* occurs phylogenetically within *Quadrula* as currently used (Campbell et al., 2005; the result of Serb et al., 2003, reflects a mixing of tissue clips with *Potamilus alatus*) and so *Rotundaria* is not available for species currently placed in *Obovaria*.

### Additional references

- Campbell, D.C., Serb, J.M., Buhay, J.E., Roe, K.J., Minton, R.L. & Lydeard, C. 2005. Phylogeny of North American amblesines (Bivalvia, Unionoida): prodigious polyphyly proves pervasive across genera. *Invertebrate Biology*, **124**(2): 131–164.
- Herrmannsen, A.N. 1849. *Indicis Generum Malacozoorum Primorida*, vol. 2. Pp. xxix–xlii, 1–717. Theodore Fischer, Cassells.
- Ortmann, A.E. 1911. A monograph of the najades of Pennsylvania, parts I and II. *Memoirs of the Carnegie Museum*, **4**(6): 279–347.
- Serb, J.M., Buhay, J.E. & Lydeard, C. 2003. Molecular systematics of the North American freshwater bivalve genus *Quadrula* (Unionidae: Ambleminae) based on mitochondrial ND1 sequences. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, **28**(1): 1–11.
- Valenciennes, A. 1827. *Coquilles fluviatiles bivalves de nouveau-continent recueillies pendant le voyage de M.M. de Humboldt et Bonpland. Recueil d'Observations de Zoologie et d'Anatomie Comparée . . . par Al. de Humboldt & A. Bonpland*, vol. 2. Pp. 225–237. Smith & Gide, Paris.

### Comments on the proposed conservation of the specific name of *Hydroporus discretus* Fairmaire & Brisout de Barneville, 1859 (Insecta, Coleoptera)

(Case 3337; see BZN **64**: 87–89)

(1) R. Angus

*President of the Balfour-Browne Club (water beetle society), Royal Holloway, University of London, Egham, Surrey, TW20 0EX, U.K.*  
(e-mail: r.angus@rhul.ac.uk)

The proposed application to have *Hydroporus neuter* placed on the Official Index of Rejected Names in Zoology has my fullest support. It is wrong that the application to conserve *H. discretus* was rejected, and appears quite outside the norm in recent cases. I gather that the application was rejected because it attracted insufficient favourable comment. My own view is that it appeared such an overwhelmingly compelling case that comment was superfluous. I very much hope that this second attempt succeeds. It would be wrong to lose such a well-known and well-established name as *Hydroporus discretus*, which must be conserved.

## (2) E.J. van Nieuwerkerken

National Museum of Natural History, Darwinweg 2, 2333 CR Leiden,  
The Netherlands (e-mail: [nieuwerkerken@naturalis.nl](mailto:nieuwerkerken@naturalis.nl))

I have now studied the case in detail; it had only briefly passed me before. I think that the authors have had very bad luck, the case is almost enough for the new nomen oblitum (Article 23.9.2 of the Code), apart from this list by Ádám. I think that the case was not presented strongly enough and that not enough people have sent positive comments. I strongly agree that the ruling should be reversed and that *Hydroporus discretus* must be conserved as a valid name for a species we have always known as *discretus* – I had never really considered the name *neuter* before.

## (3) G. Foster

Scottish Agricultural College, Research and Development Division, Auchincruive,  
Ayr, KA6 5HW, U.K.

I agree with the need to conserve the name *Hydroporus discretus* by the Commission revising their views and setting aside the name *Hydroporus neuter*. Otherwise the Commission will bring itself into disrepute for failing in its primary duty to stabilise nomenclature.

## (4) C.H.S. Watts

South Australian Museum, Science Centre, North Terrace, Adelaide, 5000 South  
Australia, Australia (e-mail: [Watts.Chris@saugov.sa.gov.au](mailto:Watts.Chris@saugov.sa.gov.au))

I totally agree that the name *Hydroporus discretus* Fairmaire & Brisout de Barneville should be conserved to avoid 'sinking' a century of work accessed through that name.

## (5) F. Marnell

National Parks and Wildlife Service, 7 Ely Place, Dublin 2, Ireland

The proposed change of name appears to contradict all zoological and nomenclatural sense and I wholeheartedly support your endeavours to have the name *Hydroporus discretus* conserved.

## (6) H.V. Shaverdo

Naturhistorisches Museum, Burgring 7, A-1010 Wien, Austria  
(e-mail: [shaverdo@mail.ru](mailto:shaverdo@mail.ru))

Systematics of the genus *Hydroporus* has been the main focus of my research for more than ten years. In numerous papers on taxonomy, faunistics, ecology, phenology and larval morphology *Hydroporus discretus* was always treated by me under this name. A very important reason to conserve the name *H. discretus* is that recently it has been published as a valid name in two very important catalogues (Nilsson, 2001, 2003). If *H. neuter* is used as a valid name, it would cause considerable nomenclatural confusion.